

Philosophical Library, 1949; Helen Leneman, "Reclaiming Jewish History: Homo-erotic Poetry of the Middle Ages," *Changing Men*, 18 (Summer/Fall 1987), 22-28; Stanley Rose, "Anti-Semitism in the Cancioneros of the Fifteenth Century: The Accusation of Sexual Indiscretions," *Hispanófila*, 78 (May 1983), 5-6; Norman Roth, "Deal Gently with the Young Man': Love of Boys in Medieval Hebrew Poetry of Spain," *Speculum*, 57 (1982), 20-51; idem, "My Beloved is Like a Gazelle': Imagery of the Beloved Boy in Religious Hebrew Poetry," *Hebrew Annual Review*, 8 (1984), 143-65; idem, "Satire and Debate in Two Famous Medieval Poems from al-Andalus: Love of Boys vs. Girls, The Pen and Other Themes," *Maghreb Review*, 4 (1979), 105-13; Jefim Schirman, "The Epebe in Medieval Hebrew Poetry," *Sefarad*, 15 (1955), 55-68.

Daniel Eisenberg

JUDEO-CHRISTIAN TRADITION

After World War II Christian theologians were horrified and conscience-stricken by the revelation of the Holocaust and by the bitter realization that the mass murder of millions of men, women, and children in the gas chambers was in some respects the logical and inevitable consequence of everything that the Christian Church had taught in regard to the Jewish people almost since the beginning of its existence. The Church had stigmatized the Jewish people as deicides and Christ-killers, as exiles rejected by God and fated to wander homeless across the face of the earth, as guilty of host profanation and ritual murder, had decreed that they be marked with the Jew badge and confined behind the walls of the ghetto. Small wonder then that Christians had remained silent in face of the mounting wave of anti-Semitism in the 1930s and finally of the deportation of their Jewish neighbors to destinations from which they never returned.

Hence in the postwar period liberal theologians undertook to find a common ground between Judaism and Christi-

anity which they labeled the "Judeo-Christian tradition." This movement required a great deal of soul-searching, since it implied a renunciation of the exclusive claim to possess the truth of revelation which all the Abrahamic religions uphold. The condemnation of Judaism by Christian thinkers and scholars in the past, it must be acknowledged, was not a conscious and deliberate injustice, but rather the consequence of deep-seated prejudices inherited from generation, and in many, of the unconscious wish to convert the Jews and to justify the policy of the Church in their regard. When Christian scholars exposed to rabbinic literature realized that their negative judgment of Judaism was false and untenable, they sensed that they had either to abandon it or to continue perpetrating an injustice. In the latter case they would be violating the principles of their own conscience, and in the former, they would have to conclude that there was no motive for seeking the conversion of the Jews or for rationalizing the treatment meted out to them by the Church and Christian legislators in the Middle Ages.

Much debate within the context of the "Judeo-Christian tradition" has turned upon the question of whether there are one, two, or many covenants between God and his people. But whatever the answer, it is clear from the historical record that all forms of Judaism and Christianity, however much or little they had in common, regarded the code of sexual morality formulated in Leviticus 18 as part of their covenant, their fundamental law. Even in the centuries before the rise of Christianity, Judaism had accepted the principle that its adherents should suffer death rather than engage in sexual immorality.

Hence for homosexuals the Judeo-Christian tradition has meant nothing but ostracism and punishment, exile and death. It has spelled rejection by close friends and relatives, denial of employment and economic opportunity, violence at the hands not just of the authorities but

also of the criminal underworld, legal penalties ranging from fines and confiscation of property to castration and death. To find anything positive in this tradition would be an arduous task; but the analogy in the relationship between Judaism and Christianity merits comment.

The Church and Synagogue have never been able to accept homosexual love as on a par with heterosexual, yet that is the precondition for any reconciliation with the gay community. To admit that the attachment of two persons of the same sex can be as selfless, as devoted, as positive in its effect on society, as the love of members of the opposite sex would have major repercussions for the theology of sexual relations. Jewish and Christian moral theologians would have to concede that the attempt to "convert" homosexuals forcibly to heterosexuality was as cruel and unjust as forced conversions in the religious sphere; and that the moral condemnation and legal prohibition of homosexual behavior, particularly since the thirteenth century, was as wrong as the anti-Judaic measures adopted by the Church from the Fourth Lateran Council (1215) onward. The effort to exclude homosexuals—a stable minority of the population—from Christian society never reduced their numbers, but produced only a vast and needless amount of human misery. It undoubtedly contributed to the persecution and killing of homosexuals in Nazi Germany which—unlike the Jewish Holocaust—went unnoticed and unprotected by Christian theologians while it was happening, and has gone uncondemned and unrequited since 1945.

A genuine new beginning in the relationship between homosexuals and the church and synagogue requires such an act of reflection and contrition on the part of the religious groups whose past record has been one of condemnation and rejection. Acquaintance with the writings of homosexual men and women across the centuries, with the record of their feelings and aspirations, of their struggle to survive

within an implacably hostile society, is a precondition for insight and understanding. Only on this basis will the Judeo-Christian tradition be able to come to terms with the biological and psychological reality of homosexual love.

Warren Johansson

JUNG, CARL GUSTAV (1875–1961)

Swiss depth psychologist. One of a number of major thinker-therapists who became active at the beginning of the twentieth century, he and his work have received the accolade of a special adjective, "Jungian."

Life. Born in Basel into a family both sides of which had members gifted with ESP powers, Jung was the son of a pastor in the Swiss Reformed Church. Reading the textbook of psychiatry written by Richard Freiherr von Krafft-Ebing convinced him that this should be his future specialty, and he took his medical degree from the University of Basel in 1902. He worked at the Burghölzli Hospital under Eugen Bleuler from 1900 to 1907. He established his reputation with a book on *The Psychology of Dementia Praecox* in 1906.

In the following year he first encountered Sigmund Freud during a trip to Vienna, and for six years the two actively corresponded and collaborated. In 1909 Jung renounced his hospital appointment in favor of his growing private practice, and also traveled with Freud to lecture at Clark University in Massachusetts. The two thinkers increasingly diverged, particularly after Jung published his own ideas in a book entitled *The Psychology of the Unconscious* (1912), later renamed *Symbols of Transformation*. At the first meeting of the International Psychoanalytic Association in Munich in 1913, the rift between Jung and Freud turned to open hostility, and the two never met again. In April 1914 Jung resigned as President of the Association.